

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the detailed remarks and analysis. Applicant requests reconsideration for the following reasons.

Claims 1-3,11-14 and 20-25 were rejected as being obvious over Parkhill et al. (U.S. 2002/0034088) in view of McCordic et al. (U.S. 6,903,931). The proposed combination is not proper as the references teach away from the proposed combination. The McCordic et al. cold plate is edge cooled, meaning that coolant is flowed along edges of the plate and not along an entire surface as is done in Parkhill. Further, a main purpose of the McCordic et al. device is to eliminate the need for fluid cooling of the cold plate (McCordic et al. Col 9, lines 45-50). This teaches away from the combination proposed by the Examiner.

In Parkhill et al. cooling flow is provided along the entire surface of the base plate to cool effectively across the entire plate (Parkhill Figures 5 and 6). Further, McCordic et al. has as a main purpose to provide less thermally conductive regions near the edges than is provided in central regions so that all devices are cooled to a substantially uniform temperature (McCordic et al. Col 2, lines 15-24). Such a structure would not work with the Parkhill device. For at least this reason the proposed combination is not proper.

Further, claim 1 requires a cold plate integrated into the module housing. Claim 11 requires a housing with an integrated cold plate. The proposed combination of Parkhill and McCordic et al. do not disclose or suggest this feature. For these reasons Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1-3,11-14 and 20-25 were rejected as being obvious over Schantz et al. in view of McCordic et al. The proposed combination of Schantz et al. with the edge cooled cold plate of McCordic et al. is not proper. The Schantz et al. device relies on cooling oil flow through the cooling plate 104 (Col 7, lines 45-55). To the contrary, the McCordic et al. device is desired to eliminate the need for fluid cooling of the cold plate (McCordic et al. Col 9, lines 45-50) and therefore teaches away from the combination proposed by the Examiner. For at least this reason Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Accordingly, the claims are believed in condition for allowance. No additional fees are seen to be required. If any additional fees are due, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482, in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds, P.C., for any

additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment. Therefore, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.

/John M. Siragusa/

John M. Siragusa
Registration No. 46,174
400 West Maple Road, Suite 350
Birmingham, Michigan 48009
Telephone: (248) 988-8360
Facsimile: (248) 988-8363

Dated: October 1, 2007